

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,521	04/19/2001	Chien-Ping Huang	55832	9464
75	90 05/30/2002			
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP 130 Water Street Boston, MA 02109-4280			EXAMINER	
			MITCHELL, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2827	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
, "-	09/838,521	HUANG ET AL.
 Office Action Summary 	Examiner	Art Unit
•	James Mitchell	2827
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) divill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 J	<u>une 2001</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non₊final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under a Disposition of Claims		
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	
Application Papers	,	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		aminor
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and acception and acception to the acception to the acception to the acception and acception acceptance acception acceptance acception acceptance	·	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		, o
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applica	ation No
Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting 		
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2827

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the priority paper filed June 25, 2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There appears to be a typographical error after the number following the phrase "vents spaced substantially at." By the use of a square following the number, it is ambiguous as to whether the number denotes a degree.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

•

Application/Control Number: 09/838,521

Art Unit: 2827

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 6. Claim 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kitamura (JP 404002195).
- 7. APA (Fig 1-2F; Page 2, Line 20 Page 3, Line 18) discloses a TBGA package configuration and a method of fabricating a ground ball bonding structure on a TBGA package constructed on a heat sink and a tape; the method comprising the steps of forming a via hole (22) in the tape (20) to expose a selected part of the heat sink (10), forming a ring-shaped ground-ball pad (31) over the tape and around the via hole, forming a solder mask (40) over the tape while unmasking the ring shaped ground ball pad, performing a solder-pasting process to paste a solder material through the solder mask into the via hole and during the solder pasting process air holes voids left in the via hole, performing a first reflow process to reflow the pasted solder in the via hole, attaching a solder ball (51) by means of a solder flux to the pasted solder in the via, performing a second reflow process so as to reflow the solder ball, the solder flux and solder paste into an integral body of solder wetted to the ring ground ball pad to serve as a ground ball connected to the heat sink.
- 8. The admitted prior art does not show forming a pad with a plurality of air vents substantially at equal radial intervals around the via hole and cut all the way into the tape until reaching the heat sink where air formed in the via are dawn via the vents to outside atmosphere thereby allowing pasted solder to substantially fill the up the via hole or that the equal radial intervals consist of 180, 120 or 90 degrees.

Page 4

Art Unit: 2827

- 9. However, Kitamura (Fig 1 and 2) utilizes a pad ("land") with air vents that are inherently cut (pad has a *hollowed out* area that is formed with cross shaped via hole, "through hole" therefore it is cut) all the way into the flexible board until reaching the opposite contact (7), providing four vents spaced substantially at equal radial intervals of 180 and 90 degrees (inherent in a cross shape).
- 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cut air vents in the pad of the admitted prior art in order to provide a secure connection via a through hole (Page 607, Paragraph 3, Lines 17-22) by obtaining an air escape passage (English Abstract).
- 11. With respect to claims 3 and 7, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose these particular dimensions because applicant has not disclosed that the dimensions are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical, and it appears prima facie that the process would possess utility using another dimension. Indeed, it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, In re Rose, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on (703) 305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

jmm Mari 22

, May 23, 2002

> DAVID E. GRAYBILL PAIMAX3 YAAMING